Application No. 10/773,304 Amendment dated June 27, 2006

Reply to Office Action of March 28, 2006

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Docket No.: 1338-0178P

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 2-5 and 11. These sheets replace the original sheets including those same Figures.

Applicant has amended the drawings to show the plastic material with the proper cross sectional hatching.

JTE/cdr Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

Docket No.: 1338-0178P

REMARKS

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in

condition for allowance.

Claims 1-5 are now present in this application. Claim 1 is independent.

Amendments have been made to the Abstract of the Disclosure and claims 1 and 5.

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Priority Under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim for foreign priority

under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of the certified priority document.

Information Disclosure Citation

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the references supplied with the

Information Disclosure Statement filed February 9, 2004, and for providing Applicant with an

initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form filed therewith.

Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings because the plastic material must be shown in

the cross-sectional view as alternating thick and thin lines.

In order to overcome this objection, Applicant is concurrently submitting Replacement

Drawing Sheets for the Examiner's approval, which address the deficiency pointed out by the

Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully

requested.

Objection to the Abstract of the Disclosure

The Examiner has objected to the Abstract of the Disclosure because of the use of legal

phraseology.

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

5

In order to overcome this objection, Applicant has amended the Abstract of the

Docket No.: 1338-0178P

Disclosure to delete the legal phraseology. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this

objection are respectfully requested.

Claim Amendments

Applicant has amended the claims in order to place the claims in better form. The claim

amendments are not being made in response to any statutory requirement for patentability, and

have not been narrowed in scope. Instead, the claims have been amended merely to recite the

subject matter therein more clearly.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph. This rejection is

respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has set forth certain instances wherein the claim language lacks antecedent

basis or is not clearly understood.

In order to overcome this rejection, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 5 to correct each

of the deficiencies specifically pointed out by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that

the claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

Applicant regard as the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection

are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states that claims 1-5 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to

overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the early indication of allowable subject matter in this

application. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended as set forth above in order to overcome the

rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph.

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

6

Application No. 10/773,304

Amendment dated June 27, 2006

Reply to Office Action of March 28, 2006

Cited References

Since the references cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but

have merely been cited to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or

rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently

outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response

has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition

for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite

prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone James T. Eller, Jr., Registration

No. 39,538, at (703) 205-8000, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies,

to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional

fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated:

JUN 21 2006

Respectfully submitted,

James T. Eller, Jr.

Registration No.: 39,538

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

Docket No.: 1338-0178P

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

7